IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE J.M.JAMES

THURSDAY, THE 11TH JANUARY 2007 / 21ST PAUSHA 1928

WP(C).No. 34456 of 2006(B)

PETITIONER:

K.K.MOHANAN, SENIOR GRADE TECHNICIAN
(HIGHER GRADE) MILMA UNIT, THRISSUR DAIRY,
RESIDING AT KATTUVALAPPIL HOUSE,
VIYYOOR P.O., THRISSUR-680 010.

BY ADV. SRI.A.JAYASANKAR
SRI.C.ANIL KUMAR

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. KERALA CO-OPERATIVE MILK MARKETING FEDERATION LIMITED, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

ADDL. R2

2. THE ERNAKULAM REGIONAL CO-OPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS UNION, EDAPPALLY, ERNAKULAM
REP. BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR.
(impleaded as per the order in I.A.379/2007 dated 11.1.2007)

BY ADV. SRI. B.S.KRISHNAN (SR), SC MILMA

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 11/01/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

APPENDIX

PETITIONER'S EXHIBITS

EXT.P1- TRUE COPY OF THE APPOINTMENT ORDER DATED 22.5.1987 ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER.

EXT.P2- TRUE COPY OF THE PROMOTION ORDER DATED 4.9.1995 ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER.

EXT.P3- TRUE COPY OF THE PROMOTION ORDER DATED 28.3.1998 ISSUED TO THE PETITIONER.

EXT.P4- TRUE COPY OF THE ORDER DATED 23.12.1998 OF THE ERNAKULAM REGIONAL CO-OPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS UNION LIMITED

EXT.P5- TRUE COPY OF THE PROMOTION POLICY OF THE RESPONDENT

EXT.P6- TRUE COPY OF THE REPRESENTATION DATED 15.9.06 SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER TO THE RESPONDENT.

(TRUE COPY)

P.A TO JUDGE

J.M.JAMES, J.

W.P.(C). 34456/2006

Dated this the 11th day of January, 2007

JUDGMENT

The writ petitioner is working as Senior Grade Technician in Trissur Dairy. It is alleged that his promotion as Special Grade Technician is being denied, despite the said post being a promotion post, as could be seen from the norms prescribed by the additional second respondent, The Ernakulam Regional Co-operative Milk Producers Union. A representation had been given before the first respondent complaining of the denial of the promotion. The same is pending with the first respondent.

2. When the matter came up for consideration, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the writ petitioner is working in Thrissur Dairy and, therefore, it comes within the region of additional second respondent. Accordingly, the latter had been impleaded, through a separate order.

3. Considering the facts that are placed before me,

I direct the writ petitioner to prefer a fresh representation before the additional second respondent, stating his grievance. The additional second respondent shall hear the writ petitioner and dispose of the same on merit, within six weeks from the date of receipt of the representation as well as the production of a copy of this judgment, along with other documents, if any.

The writ petition is disposed of as above.

J.M.JAMES
JUDGE

mrcs